

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,409	06/23/2003	Birgit Schleifenbaum	3968.031	8762
30448 7: AKERMAN SEI	590 03/08/2007 NTERFITT		EXAM	INER
P.O. BOX 3188		WONG, LESLIE A		
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE '	
3 MON	THS .	03/08/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/602,409	SCHLEIFENBAUM ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Leslie Wong	1761			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period fo	r Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🖂	□ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/5/05 and 11/7/06.					
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims		•			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>25-35</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>25-35</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachmen	t(s)					
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

Application/Control Number: 10/602,409

Art Unit: 1761

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (US Patent No. 4576737) and Cherukuri et al (US Patent No. 5004595) in view of Noreille et al (US 5094156) and Mothes et al (US 5104799).

Johnson teaches an encapsulated flavor composition wherein a carrier is used to form an emulsion and the emulsion is sprayed into a fluidized bed agglomerator charged with a small quantity of particulate carrier or small encapsulates (see entire patent, especially the claims).

Cherukuri et al teach a multiple encapsulated flavor delivery system and method where the flavor is encapsulated using a fluidized bed type process (see entire document).

The claims differ as to the residence time, the height, and the use of a sifter.

Noreille et al disclose an agglomeration process using a fluidized bed process in combination with a sifter (see entire patent, especially column 4, line 60 to column 5,

Application/Control Number: 10/602,409

Art Unit: 1761

line 8). Noreille et al also disclose that the color, texture, and density of the final product may be varied by adjustment of the process conditions (see column 6, lines 30-31).

Mothes et al disclose a process for the preparation of granules using a fluidized bed and countercurrent gravity sifters (see column 1, line 55 to column 2, line 2).

The residence time and the height would be obvious to that of Johnson and Cherukuri et al as the same components and equipment are utilized.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to use sifters and adjust the processing parameters as taught by Noreille et al and Mothes et al in that of Johnson and Cherukuri because the adjustment of parameters and the use of sifters is conventional when using fluidized bed technology in the production of flavors.

It is also noted that to make a process continuous does not add patentability to the claims, see In re Korpi, 602 OG 672.

In the absence of unexpected results, it is not seen how the claimed invention differs from the teachings of the prior art. Applicant's claims are drawn to a combination of known components which produces expected results, see In re Kerkhoven 205 USPQ 1069 and In re Gershon 152 USPQ 602.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-1411. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/602,409

Art Unit: 1761

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leslie Wong

Primary Examiner

Jeshi Wong

Art Unit 1761

LAW

March 2, 2007